



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/588,683	06/07/2000	Katsutoshi Ushida	862.C1923	9220

5514 7590 03/25/2005

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO  
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA  
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

ENGLAND, DAVID E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/588,683

Applicant(s)

USHIDA, KATSUTOSHI

Examiner

David E. England

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-100 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-100 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 June 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                                        |                                                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1 – 100 are presented for examination.

### ***Drawings***

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the “functional information for a facsimile defined by a Tagged Image File Format (TIFF)” must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the “display on an operation panel” must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet”

Art Unit: 2143

pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1 – 100 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6. The “backlash”, “/”, presented in the limitation of “transmitting/receiving” is ambiguous in meaning (example: it could be “and”, “or”, etc.) and is not clarified by the specification as to its specific meaning. Applicant is asked to amend to clarify meaning.

7. All other claims that do not specifically have this limitation are rejected for their dependency on the independent claims with this limitation.

8. Claims 2 – 21, 48 and 89 – 92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

9. The “backlash”, “/”, presented in the limitation of “and/or” is improper claim language, is ambiguous in meaning and is not clarified by the specification as to its specific meaning. Applicant is asked to amend to clarify meaning.

Art Unit: 2143

10. Claims 3 – 21, 48 and 89 – 92 are rejected for their dependency on claim 2.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 1 – 4, 7 – 15, 25, 27, 30, 31, 34 – 38, 42, 43, 45, 47, 49, 51 – 67, 72, 82, 84 and 86 – 100 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joffe et al. (6600750) (hereinafter Joffe) in view of RFC 2306.

13. As per claim 1, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Joffe teaches a communication apparatus comprising:

14. means for transmitting/receiving electronic mail data by connecting to the Internet, (e.g. col. 1, line 16 – col. 2, line 57); and

15. means for communicating the electronic mail data with facsimile-format image data attached thereto by performing communication pertaining to functional information in addition to the communication of the electronic mail data, (e.g., col. 4, lines 10 – 20); and attaching a Tagged Image File Format (TIFF) file, (e.g., col. 4, lines 10 – 20).

16. Joffe does not specifically teach means for communicating the electronic mail data with facsimile-format image data attached thereto by performing communication pertaining to

Art Unit: 2143

functional information in, which is functional information for a facsimile defined by a Tagged Image File Format (TIFF), addition to the communication of the electronic mail data.

17. RFC 2306 teaches means for communicating the electronic mail data with facsimile-format image data attached thereto by performing communication pertaining to functional information in, which is functional information for a facsimile defined by a Tagged Image File Format (TIFF), addition to the communication of the electronic mail data, (e.g., pages 16 – 18, "*It is recommended that all fields from the table in 3.9.1.1 SHOULD be included when writing TIFF-F files in order to minimize dependencies on default values.*"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was filed, to combine RFC 2306 with Joffe because not only is it a standard published by the IETF but could order to minimize dependencies on default values.

18. As per claim 2, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Joffe teaches a communication apparatus comprising:

19. first connecting means for connecting to a local area network and/or second connecting means for connecting to a wide area network, (e.g. col. 1, line 16 – col. 2, line 57);

20. first communicating means for transmitting/receiving electronic mail data by connecting to the Internet by one of said first and second connecting means, (e.g. col. 1, line 16 – col. 2, line 57); and

21. second communicating means for performing facsimile communication by connecting to the wide area network by said second connecting means, (e.g. col. 1, line 16 – col. 2, line 57 & Fig. 3), and

Art Unit: 2143

22. wherein communication concerning functional information is performed when said first communicating means communicates electronic mail data having image data attached, (e.g., col. 4, lines 10 – 20), and attaching a Tagged Image File Format (TIFF) file, (e.g., col. 4, lines 10 – 20). Joffe does not specifically teach wherein communication concerning functional information, which is functional information for a facsimile defined by a Tagged Image File Format (TIFF), is performed when said first communicating means communicates electronic mail data having image data attached.

23. RFC 2306 teaches wherein communication concerning functional information, which is functional information for a facsimile defined by a Tagged Image File Format (TIFF), is performed when said first communicating means communicates electronic mail data having image data attached, (e.g., pages 16 – 18, "*It is recommended that all fields from the table in 3.9.1.1 SHOULD be included when writing TIFF-F files in order to minimize dependencies on default values.*"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was filed, to combine RFC 2306 with Joffe because of similar reasons stated above.

24. As per claim 4, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Joffe teaches if there is no response to the communication concerning functional information from a communication partner apparatus with which said first communicating means communicates and if communication by said second communicating means is designated and a number of a receiving party is designated, said second communicating means communicates image data, (e.g. col. 1, line 16 – col. 2, line 57 & col. 4, line 13 – col. 5, line 35).

Art Unit: 2143

25. As per claim 7, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Joffe teaches if a communication error occurs during the communication by said first communicating means, electronic mail data describing information concerning communication error information is transmitted to said communication partner apparatus or a previously designated electronic mail address, (e.g. col. 2, line 30 – col. 3, line 62).

26. As per claim 8, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Joffe teaches wherein if a communication error occurs during the communication by said first communicating means, electronic mail data having image data attached is transmitted to said communication partner apparatus or to a previously designated electronic mail address, (e.g. col. 2, line 30 – col. 3, line 62).

27. As per claim 11, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Joffe teaches wherein if connection to said first communicating means is dial-up connection, communication concerning functional information, communication of a text, and communication concerning delivery confirmation are successively performed by a single call, (e.g. col. 7, line 50 – col. 8, line 54).

28. As per claim 12, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Joffe teaches wherein if connection to said first communicating means is dial-up connection, communication concerning functional information, communication of a text, and communication concerning delivery confirmation are separately performed by at least two calls, (e.g. col. 2, line 30 – col. 3, line 62 & col. 4, lines 13 – 67 & col. 7, line 50 – col. 8, line 54).



29. As per claim 13, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Joffe teaches wherein if connection to said first communicating means is dial-up connection, communication concerning functional information, communication of a text, and communication concerning delivery confirmation are successively performed by a single call or separately performed by different calls, (e.g. col. 2, line 30 – col. 3, line 62 & col. 4, lines 13 – 67 & col. 7, line 50 – col. 8, line 54).

30. As per claim 14, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Joffe teaches wherein if connection to said first communicating means is dial-up connection, a line is once disconnected to wait for timeout processing in communication, (e.g. col. 5, line 63 – col. 6, line 50).

31. As per claim 15, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Joffe teaches wherein if connection to said first communicating means is dial-up connection, a line is once disconnected to wait for timeout processing in communication, and timeout is selectively verified by recall, (e.g. col. 5, line 63 – col. 6, line 50).

32. As per claim 48, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Joffe teaches wherein said wide area network is one of PSTN and ISDN, (e.g. col. 1, lines 14 – 56).

33. Claims 25, 27, 30, 31, 34 – 38, 42, 43, 45, 47, 49, 51 – 67, 72, 82, 84 and 86 – 100 are rejected for similar reasons and can be found in the disclosed reference as stated above.

Art Unit: 2143

34. Claims 3, 9, 10, 26, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joffe et al. (6600750) (hereinafter Joffe) in view of RFC 2306 in further view of Applicant's admitted prior art.

35. As per claim 3, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Joffe and RFC 2306 teach all that is similar in nature above as it applies to the claim language below, furthermore Applicant's admitted prior art teaches if there is no response to the communication concerning functional information from a communication partner apparatus with which said first communicating means communicates, electronic mail data is sent by said first communicating means by attaching image data corresponding to a baseline image data format standard, (e.g. page 1, line 13 – page 3, line 20). RFC 2306 teaches electronic mail data is sent by said first communicating means by attaching image data corresponding to a baseline image data format standard which the communication partner is able to process, (e.g., pages 2 – 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was filed, to combine Applicant's admitted prior art with the combine system of Joffe and RFC 2306 for similar reasons stated above.

36. As per claim 9, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Joffe teaches wherein if a communication error occurs during the communication by said first communicating means, communication is performed in accordance with designation of whether transmission of electronic mail by attaching image data by a baseline image format standard which the communication partner is able to process or retransmission is to be performed, (e.g. col. 2, line

Art Unit: 2143

30 – col. 3, line 62 & col. 4, lines 13 – 67). Furthermore, Applicant admits in prior art whether transmission of electronic mail by attaching image data by the most baseline image standards, (e.g. page 1, line 19 – page 3, line 20); and RFC 2306 teaches image data corresponding to a baseline image data format standard which the communication partner is able to process, (e.g., pages 2 – 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Applicant's admitted prior art with the combine system of Joffe and RFC 2306 for similar reasons stated above, furthermore, it would save time in transmission if a predefined "standard" communication means was established as a backup.

37. As per claim 10, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Joffe and RFC 2306 teach all that is similar in nature above as it applies to the claim language below, furthermore Applicant admits in the prior art that wherein the baseline image format standard is an MH coding system considered to be essential of functional information defined by ITU-T T.30, by which a resolution in a main scan direction is 8 pels/mm, a resolution in a sub-scan direction is 3.85 lines/mm, and an original width is 208 mm of A4 size, (e.g. page 1, line 19 – page 3, line 20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Applicant's admitted prior art with the combine system of Joffe and RFC 2306 for similar reasons as stated above.

38. Claims 26, 32 and 33 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Art Unit: 2143

39. Claims 5, 6, 22, 28, 29 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joffe et al. (6600750) (hereinafter Joffe) in view of RFC 2306 in further view of Applicant's admitted prior art, in further view of Seo (6124947).

40. As per claim 5, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Joffe and RFC 2306 do not specifically teach wherein if during the communication by said first communicating means a communication error occurs in communication of image data and in communication pertaining to delivery confirmation, retransmission is performed by selecting a number of times of retransmission from a plurality of individually preset number of times of retransmission including zero, in accordance with the contents of the communication error. Seo teaches wherein if during the communication by said first communicating means a communication error occurs in communication of image data and in communication pertaining to delivery confirmation, retransmission is performed by selecting a number of times of retransmission from a plurality of individually preset number of times of retransmission including zero, in accordance with the contents of the communication error, (e.g. col. 5, line 45 – col. 6, line 45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Seo with the combine system of Joffe, RFC 2306 and Applicant's admitted prior art because it would be more convenient for a user to input exactly how many time to attempt a retransmission if an error were to occur as opposed to having to go through the faxing process manually over and over again.

Art Unit: 2143

41. As per claim 6, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Joffe, RFC 2306 and Seo do not specifically teach wherein no retransmission is performed if the contents of the communication error indicate that there is no destination address.

Examiner takes Official Notice (see MPEP § 2144.03) that " wherein no retransmission is performed if the contents of the communication error indicate that there is no destination address " in a computer networking environment was well known in the art at the time the invention was made. The Applicant is entitled to traverse any/all official notice taken in this action according to MPEP § 2144.03, namely, "if applicant traverses such an assertion, the examiner should cite a reference in support of his or her position". However, MPEP § 2144.03 further states "See also In re Boon, 439 F.2d 724, 169 USPQ 231 (CCPA 1971) (a challenge to the taking of judicial notice must contain adequate information or argument to create on its face a reasonable doubt regarding the circumstances justifying the judicial notice)." Specifically, In re Boon, 169 USPQ 231, 234 states "as we held in Ahlert, an applicant must be given the opportunity to challenge either the correctness of the fact asserted or the notoriety or repute of the reference cited in support of the assertion. We did not mean to imply by this statement that a bald challenge, with nothing more, would be all that was needed". Further note that 37 CFR § 1.671(c)(3) states "Judicial notice means official notice". Thus, a traversal by the Applicant that is merely "a bald challenge, with nothing more" will be given very little weight. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Applicant's admitted prior art with the combine system of Joffe and RFC 2306 because if there is no destination address there can be no retransmission let alone a first transmission with out a destination address whether a email address or fax number.

42. As per claim 5, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Joffe and RFC 2306 do not specifically teach switching a display on an operation panel related to functional information based on information in said database, if an address of another party is input in said first communication procedure. Seo teaches switching a display on an operation panel related to functional information based on information in said database, if an address of another party is input in said first communication procedure, (e.g., col. 5, lines 46 – 67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Seo with the combine system of Joffe, RFC 2306 and Applicant's admitted prior art because of similar reasons stated above and furthermore it would be efficient for a system to display the dynamism of information that is changing in the system so the user can confirm which numbers the information is being set to.

43. Claims 22, 28 and 29 are rejected for similar reasons and can be found in the disclosed reference as stated above.

44. Claims 16 – 20, 23, 24, 39 – 40, 46, 50, 68 – 71, 73 – 81, 83 and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joffe in view of RFC 2306 in further view of Applicant's admitted prior art, in further view of Miller, Jr. et al. (6356356) (hereinafter Miller).

45. As per claim 16, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Joffe and RFC 2306 do not specifically teach wherein functional information of a destination apparatus is acquired by

Art Unit: 2143

communication using one of said first and second communicating means, a database for holding a maximum capability supported by each function is registered or updated, and, if said first communicating means is to communicate data, the data is converted into a standard registered in said database and communicated. Miller teaches wherein functional information of a destination apparatus is acquired by communication using one of said first and second communicating means, a database for holding a maximum capability supported by each function is registered or updated, and, if said first communicating means is to communicate data, the data is converted into a standard registered in said database and communicated, (e.g. col. 3, line 30 – col. 4, line 55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Miller with the combine system of Joffe, RFC 2306 and Applicant's admitted prior art because it would be more efficient for a system to utilize the functionality of a database that is commonly used for storing information about users and/or devices on a network.

46. As per claim 17, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Joffe teaches all that is described above but does not specifically teach wherein whether image data pertaining to said database is to be converted is set for each function item registered in said database. Miller teaches wherein whether image data pertaining to said database is to be converted is set for each function item registered in said database, (e.g. col. 3, line 30 – col. 4, line 55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Miller with the combine system of Joffe, RFC 2306 and Applicant's admitted prior art because it would be cause less errors in the receiving system if the data was converted to a format that the receiving system could process.

47. As per claim 18, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Joffe and RFC 2306 do not specifically teach if an address of another party with respect to said first communicating means is input, display information related to functional information is switched on an operation based on information in said database.

48. Miller teaches if an address of another party with respect to said first communicating means is input, display information related to functional information is switched on an operation based on information in said database, (e.g. col. 3, line 30 – col. 4, line 55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Miller with the combine system of Joffe, RFC 2306 and Applicant's admitted prior art because it would be more convenient for a user to have the system convert the destination number to the address that it is associated with it.

49. As per claim 19, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Joffe teaches wherein if a communication error occurs in said first communicating means, said second communicating means communicates image data if communication by said second communicating means is designated and a telephone number of another party is set. Miller teaches wherein if a communication error occurs in said first communicating means, said second communicating means communicates image data if communication by said second communicating means is designated and a telephone number of another party is set, (e.g. col. 3, line 30 – col. 4, line 55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to



Art Unit: 2143

combine Miller with the combine system of Joffe, RFC 2306 and Applicant's admitted prior art for similar reasons as stated above.

50. Claims 20, 23, 24, 39 – 40, 46, 50, 68 – 71, 73 – 81, 83 and 85 are rejected for similar reasons and can be found in the disclosed reference as stated above.

51. Claims 21 and 44 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joffe in view of RFC 2306 in further view of Applicant's admitted prior art, in further view of Wolf (6535303).

52. As per claim 21, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Joffe and RFC 2306 teaches all that is described above but does not specifically teach wherein when said first communicating means is to perform communication concerning the functional information, of pieces of functional information defined by ITU-T T.30, functional information pertaining to communication such as a handshake rate, a modem rate, a minimum transmission time, the presence/absence of error correction mode, and the presence/absence of G4 function need not be exchanged. Applicant's admitted prior art teaches wherein when said first communicating means is to perform communication concerning the functional information, of pieces of functional information defined by ITU-T T.30, functional information pertaining to communication such as a handshake rate, a modem rate, a minimum transmission time, the presence/absence of error correction mode need not be exchanged, (e.g. page 1, line 13 – page 3, line 20) and Wolf teaches the G4 function, (e.g. col. 3, lines 14 – 61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 2143

the art at the time the invention was made to combine Wolf with the combine system of Joffe, RFC 2306 and Applicant's admitted prior art for similar reasons as stated above.

53. Claim 44 is rejected for similar reasons and can be found in the disclosed reference as stated above.

### ***Response to Arguments***

54. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 100 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

55. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

56. a. Bloomfield U.S. Patent No. 6693729 discloses Facsimile to E-mail communication system with local interface.

57. b. Parsons et al. RFC 2302 discloses Tag Image File Format (TIFF) - image/tiff MIME Sub-type Registration.

58. c. Toyoda et al. RFC 2305 discloses A Simple Mode of Facsimile Using Internet Mail.

59. d. Masinter et al. RFC 2532 discloses Extended Facsimile Using Internet Mail.

Art Unit: 2143

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 571-272-3912.


The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David E. England  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2143

De



DAVID WILEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100